

Claim 13 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Griffiths et al. in view of Cook et al.

Claim 14 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Griffiths et al. in view of Delson et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the magnetic circuit created by the flux linkage between the coils and magnetic poles "includes a helical component which induces either a force as a result of changes in the flux linkage or changes in the flux linkage as a result of the relative linear movement." As used in claim 1, the term "magnetic circuit" is synonymous with the term "magnetic field." Support for this limitation can be found in the specification on page 2, lines 23-30, and on page 6, lines 19-26, for example. In contrast, Griffith et al. teaches, at page 1, lines 40-42, that the motor "produces a magnetic field perpendicular to the longitudinal axis" of the device. As such, Griffith et al. does not teach or suggest a magnetic field or circuit having a helical component. In Griffith et al., the embodiment wherein both the armature and the stator have a helix, page 3 lines 71-94, one is clockwise and the other is "anti-clockwise" with the "same tooth width and pitch" so that this embodiment does not meet the limitations of claim 1.

New independent claim 17 specifically requires the helix field to be oriented in the same direction which clearly distinguishes over the teaching of Griffith et al. This is clearly illustrated in Figures 4a-4e and distinguishes over Griffith et al.


Applicant: Michael Dadd
Application No.: 09/530,629

In view of the foregoing, claims 1 and 17 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Dadd

By 
C. Frederick Koenig III
Registration No. 29,662
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
Suite 400, One Penn Center
1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Philadelphia, PA 19103

CFK/DAN/ns